

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as present amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, 9-15, 17-18, 20-23, and 25 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 14, 15, 23, and 25 have been amended to address cosmetic matters of form. Support for amended Claims 1, 14, 15, 23, and 25 can be found at least on pages 21-26 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

The outstanding Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3-5, 9-15, 17, 18, 20-23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moshfeghi (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The outstanding Official Action has rejected Claims 1, 3-5, 9-15, 17, 18, 20-23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moshfeghi. The Official Action contends that Moshfeghi discloses all of Applicant's claim features, with the exception of the determination that the root document folder is not active in the user profile. The Official Action contends that it would have been obvious to provide a root document folder or content information presented as a folder within the user interface based on access permissions and user profiles in view of Moshfeghi, and that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify the teaching of Moshfeghi to arrive at Applicant's claims. Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 1 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to, *inter alia*,

... a request-related information management unit configured to manage request-related information items of a user profile, and to process a request received from an external device operably linked to the Web server through a network, the request including a request-related information item, the request-related information item being transmitted to a data repository by the request-

related information management unit for obtaining an identification of a document path from the data repository in response;

a request-related information activation unit configured to activate a root document folder within the hierarchical organization of information, the root document folder corresponding to the document path of the request-related information item of the request, in the user profile, upon determination that the root document folder is not active in the user profile; and

a Web page creation unit configured to create a Web page based on the user profile, corresponding document path and activated root document folder, including a user interface displaying the request-related information item as a component of the document path, including the root document folder.

Independent Claims 14, 15, 23, and 25 recite similar features as Claim 1.

Turning now to the applied reference, Moshfeghi describes that a user directory 22 preferably stores for each user authentication information, role information, access control information, general information, and so forth. Authentication information includes data used to identify a user as authorized to access the client-server system. Access control information includes data indicative of a user's authority to access and update the various types of data stored through the system. A system administrator is authorized to read and update the user directory and user profile databases.<sup>1</sup>

However, Moshfeghi does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed "request-related information activation unit configured to *activate a root document folder within the hierarchical organization of information, the root document folder corresponding to the document path of the request-related information item of the request, in the user profile*, upon determination that the root document folder is not active in the user profile."

Page 3 of the outstanding Official Action cites column 7, lines 50-67, specifically "[t]he system administrator is authorized to read and update the user directory and user profile databases," as disclosing the above feature. However, in Moshfeghi, a system administrator merely updates a user directory which includes data indicative of a user's

---

<sup>1</sup> See Moshfeghi at column 7, lines 51-67.

authority to access and update the various types of data stored in the system.<sup>2</sup> Further, the user profile only includes linking information addressing the network resources allowed to the user.

In contrast, in Applicant's amended Claim 1, there is a request-related information activation unit configured to activate a root document folder within a hierarchical organization of information, the root document folder corresponding to the document path of the request-related information item of the request, in the user profile, upon determination that the root document folder is not active in the user profile. In Moshfeghi, there is no such hierarchical structure. In Moshfeghi, only URLs are modified by the system administrator based on the access permission level of a user.

Also, Moshfeghi does not "display a request related item as a component of the document path," as recited in Applicant's amended independent Claim 1. In Moshfeghi, a user is merely given access to various URLs.<sup>3</sup> Listing URLs is not the same as displaying a request related item as *a component* of the document path.

Furthermore, there is no evidence for a motivation to modify the teachings from the reference so as to arrive at Applicant's claimed inventions. The position that these teachings *could* be modified to arrive at the claimed inventions would be insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.<sup>4</sup>

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

---

<sup>2</sup> Moshfeghi at column 7, lines 51-67.

<sup>3</sup> See Moshfeghi at column 14, lines 16-24.

<sup>4</sup> See MPEP 2143.01 stating that the "fact that references can be combined or modified is not sufficient to establish *prima facie* obviousness"; see also same section stating "[a]lthough a prior art device 'may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so,'" (citation omitted).

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 3-5, 9-15, 17-18, 20-23, and 25 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

*Kurt M. Berger*

James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Scott A. McKeown  
Registration No. 42,866

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\DPB\0557 Ricoh\251699US\251699US-AM2.DOC

**Kurt M. Berger Ph.D.**  
Registration No. 51,461